THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, JULY, 1910

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

Thirty-nine Branch Committees; 15,317 members in 299 cities, towns, and villages.*

MISS MARY S. AMES, President.

Vice-Presidents.
MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,
MISS AGNES IRWIN,
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer,
Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y.
Room 615 Kensington Building,
Boston.

* *Net present membership of women over 21 years of age: eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations and removals from the state*

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION.

THE annual meeting of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women was held at the home of Mrs. Henry M. Whitney, 54 Beacon Street, May 4. Mrs. James M. Codman presided, in the absence of the President, Mrs. G. Howland Shaw, who was unable to be present. Mrs. Codman welcomed the large number of members who were present, and spoke briefly of the activities of the year. Reports were made by the secretary, treasurer and chairmen of various committees.

Mrs. A. J. George of Brookline made a report in behalf of the Organization and Education Committees. At the last annual meeting, a membership of 14,010 was reported, which was increased to 14,549 before the printing of the July REMONSTRANCE. During the last twelve months a total gain of 1486 new members has been made. Eighty-two members have died; 16 have resigned; 81 have removed from the state; so that, on May 1, 1910, the net membership was 15,317, a net gain, when all corrections are made, of 1307 over last year. This membership is composed of Massachusetts women 21 years of age and upwards. There has been a marked increase during the year in requests for literature. State and college libraries, clubs and individuals have written for pamphlets and information. These requests have come from 26 states and from Canada. In answer to these requests for literature and at the parlor meetings of the Association in different cities and towns, 16,252 pamphlets have been distributed. Sixteen sets of bound volumes of pamphlets have been sent to public libraries, in most instances in response to requests from librarians. In addition, about 30,000 copies of THE REMONSTRANCE have been sent to members, subscribers, newspaper editors, members of legislatures and others.

Mrs. Henry M. Whitney reported in behalf of the Committee on Interstate Work. Among the most important incidents of the year were the organization of a fully-equipped State Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women in Pennsylvania, making five in all; the sending of expressions of regret to President Taft because of his consent to address the woman suffrage convention at Washington; and the presentation to Congress of protests against the proposed suffrage amendment, signed by the officers of the five anti-suffrage associations. Letters of thanks were sent to members of the Maryland legislature who voted against the proposed municipal suffrage bill for Baltimore, and the cordial replies received showed the value of such expressions. The Massachusetts Association, and the New York and Illinois Associations as well, have distributed large quantities of literature in the states in which proposed suffrage amendments are now pending. That there are at the present moment four such states shows the urgent necessity of organized effort. It is not too sanguine to hope that each year may see the birth of a new state organization; and our aim should be not to rest until every State in the Union has an organized anti-suffrage Association or Committee.

Officers for the ensuing year were elected as follows:

President, Mrs. G. Howland Shaw; vice-presidents, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles Eliot Guild, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, Mrs Henry M. Whitney; treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman; recording secretary, Miss Elizabeth Johnson; corresponding secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong; executive committee, the officers and Miss Mary S. Ames, Mrs. Martin L. Cate, Miss Sarah H. Crocker, Mrs. H. L. Dodd, Miss Katharine E. Guild, Miss Elizabeth H. Houghton, Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Miss Elizabeth McCracken, Miss L. C. Post, Mrs. B. L. Robinson, Mrs. R. M. Saltonstall and Miss Elizabeth P. Sohier.

The regular business of the meeting being finished, Mrs. Cod-

man presented Talcott Williams, LL.D., of Philadelphia, who gave an address on "Suffrage and the State." Mrs. C. C. Ely also spoke on her recent experiences in Washington.

Resignation of the President

At a meeting of the Executive Committee, held Friday, May 27, the resignation of the President, Mrs. G. Howland Shaw, was received with the greatest regret and most unwillingly accepted.

The following expression of appreciation of Mrs. Shaw's long and devoted service was presented by Mrs. Codman and Miss Ames and unanimously accepted:

The members of the Executive Committee and of the Association desire to place on record an expression of their regret at the resignation of Mrs. Shaw and to assure her of their appreciation of all that she has done for them, and of their gratitude for her devotion to the cause which they represent.

She was one of the original opponents of woman suffrage and for years before the formation of this Association in 1895 was engaged in the work; and those who have longest worked with her know that whatever measure of success may have been attained is largely due to her unfailing interest, sound judgment, and prudent counsels. Even when debarred from active participation, she has kept herself thoroughly informed of all that has been done, and her advice on all knotty points has been often sought and never withheld.

May she long continue this wise interest, even though her official connection with the Association must cease.

Miss Mary S. Ames was chosen to succeed Mrs. Shaw as President.

A DISAPPOINTED SUFFRAGIST.

In Everybody's Magazine for May, Judge Ben B. Lindsey of Denver gave a vivid account of the campaign which he led in that city in 1908 against corruption and corporate influence, which he characterizes by turns as "the Beast" and "the System." He took occasion to reiterate that woman suffrage is right, just and expedient, and to acknowledge the help received from women's votes; but he described as follows his disappointing experience in trying to enlist the leading women of Denver in his campaign:

I tried the leaders of the Woman's Club. One able and wealthy woman, of whose support I was certain, confessed that she could not even sign the nominating petition. She said that if any woman of wealth wished to take part in such a fight she would have to invest her money in another state. Her own investments were in Denver, and if she were to champion our cause publicly the corporations would make her suffer for it ruinously. Another leader told me: "You know, Judge Lindsey, I would like to help you, but my husband is in business, and his business depends largely upon the good will of Mr. Evans. He has large contracts with the county. He has told me that I must not under any conditions attend your meetings or do anything like that. It would be very offensive to Mr. Evans and the business men." Another said: "I know you're right, Judge, but my husband is in the City Hall. Some day I hope he will be free — so that *I* may be free — but he isn't now." At the beginning of the campaign, I went to practically all the woman's suffrage leaders who, at national meetings, had been telling how much the women had done for the Juvenile Court in Denver; and none of them dared help me. Women like Mrs. Mary C. Bradford and Mrs. Lafferty (who was a member of the last legislature) took the platform against me and supported the System in its attempt to "get" the Juvenile Court. Mrs. Scott Saxton of the Woman's Club stood practically alone in her open, public support of our anti-corporation campaign.

Beauty and the Beast! I am, and I have always been, an enthusiastic advocate of woman's suffrage. In our Juvenile Court campaigns the women, like the "church element," have given us a loyal and victorious support. But if any one believes that woman's suffrage is a panacea for all the evils of our political life, he does not know what those evils are. The women are as free of the power of the Beast as the men are — and no freer. Their clubs in Denver have not dared offend it any more than the churches have. In a typical American community such as ours, where the Beast rules, the women are as helpless as the rest of us. They are bound by the same bread-and-butter considerations as the rest of us. Their leaders in politics are politicians; when they get their nominations from the corporation machines, they do the work of the corporations; and there is almost no way, under the Beast, to get a party nomination except from a corporation machine. Women in politics are human beings; they are not "ministering angels" of an ethereal ideality; and they are unable to free us, because they are not free themselves.

SUFFRAGE DISCORDS.

Emma H. de Zouchi, reviewing in The New York World for May 1, what she describes as an unparalleled year of woman's struggle for the franchise, brought to an extraordinary finish by the overwhelming defeat in the Assembly at Albany, regards this vote as "the key-note of the nation." She remarks:

In the face of unprecedented pressure of wealth and social prestige, of a restless ingenuity on the part of the once appealing, now imperative suppliant, despite the growing army of male sponsors representing the "interests," the reply has been given — not meagerly, not apologetically, but embittered by contempt and contumely — "More babies not ballots!"

Three weeks earlier, the writer thinks, this reply might have been mitigated and the dissenting majority certainly would have been lessened; but in the intervening time the climax of the situation was furnished by the proceedings at Washington of the national conventions of the suffragists and the Daughters of the American Revolution. On the one hand, she says, "it was furnished by the massacre of candidates lulled to security as the unanimous choice of their state, only to be traitorously sacrificed at the polls. On the other it was shown in the sale and barter of independence, a bargain which included the loss of two long-tried and loyal officers."

Of the influences which controlled these two assemblies and the methods which characterized them, she goes on to say:

On this occasion, however, the suffragists, possibly to get even, forestalled the Daughters. They began with battle, continued with battle, concluded with battle and are still in the thick of the fight. The Daughters ably sustained their reputation. Each body held formal sessions for five days and prolonged their sittings into the sixth. In the case of the Daughters the whole vitality of the Congress was compressed into a single issue — the election of ten Vice-Presidents-General who should decide the balance of power in the Governing Board. With the suffragists the struggle of a corresponding secretary for vindication against administrative odds and the acceptance of the princely gift of Mrs. Oliver H. P. Belmont under conditions which held the National Association in fief to her, formed the consuming interest of the convention.

Both assemblies were at the mercy of a small group of women who represented the entire contending forces. In a word, 700 suffragists and 1,600 Daughters, delegates of more than 150,000 of the negligible quantity in the nation's government, went down to Washington for political ends, and obtained them by political methods which might well give men pause. The finishing education for the ballot, viewed as a genius for political shrewdness and intrigue, has been completed in the woman's organizations of the United States, its inspiring causes the lust for power and the ambition for personal advancement.

The hissing of the President of the United States by the suffragists, deplorable in itself and an offense to the nation as an insult to the great office in its relation to the progress of the cause, takes its place as an incident. But the division and weakening of the forces contending for the ballot becomes self-destruction. In its banner year the movement has suffered a most inglorious set-back.

LAWS AND THEIR ENFORCEMENT

Woman Suffrage cannot achieve what its advocates expect. They maintain that it will reform public morals, close the saloons and other places of evil resort, and realize absolute prudence, honesty and economy in management. But it is a dream. Laws that do not command the votes of the majority of the men of a community cannot permanently be executed. Law-abiding citizens require no force to secure their obedience to the law; but those disposed to break it can be compelled to keep it only by force. Were women admitted to political life after the enthusiasm had declined, a strong tendency would arise in both great parties to pass all kinds of laws to please women; many of which would be dead letters unless they carried the judgment of a majority of male citizens. — *Dr. James M. Buckley.*

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE.

In New York, the Judiciary Committee of the Assembly having refused to report the proposed suffrage amendment to the constitution, the attempt was made, in the suffrage interest, to induce the Assembly to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution, in order that the matter might be brought to a vote. The Assembly, April 27, by a vote of 87 to 46, refused to do this. The suffrage leaders professed to find encouragement in this vote, and one of them, Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, is reported as saying that it "marked the high-water mark for woman suffrage in recent years in New York." Fifteen years before, in 1895, both branches of the New York legislature actually voted in favor of submitting a suffrage amendment to the people. So also, in Massachusetts, in 1894, the House actually passed a municipal suffrage bill. Yet when in the present year, the New York Assembly votes against suffrage by nearly two to one, and the Massachusetts House votes against it by nearly three to one, the suffragists profess pleasure and talk about a "high water mark." How much of such prosperity as this can their cause endure, and still be taken seriously?

In The Senate, the New York suffragists fared no better. The vote was taken May 26, almost exactly a month after the vote in the Assembly; and every conceivable pressure was brought to bear in the intervening time. Yet the Senate refused, 16 to 30, — again an adverse vote of almost 2 to 1, to discharge the Judiciary Committee from consideration of the resolution conveying the constitutional amendment to give suffrage to women. These overwhelmingly adverse votes are all that the New York suffragists have to show for a year of unexampled activity, active lobbying and lavish expenditure.

Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, writing in The Independent for May 28, in a tone of mild regret, of the hissing of the President at Washington, remarks that, while in Great Britain hissing by an audience is as common as applause, in the United States we are noted for tolerance at public meetings, and she adds: "In all the long years of those working for woman suffrage, this is the first known instance of such an expression of disapproval, although many times the provocation has been almost too much to bear in silence." If Mrs. Harper had attended suffrage hearings before legislative committees in the Massachusetts State House for the last dozen years or so she would not have made so unguarded a statement.

It Will Be Remembered that the suffragists undertook to obtain a round million of signatures to the petition which they presented to Congress last April. They were engaged in the work for over a year, and from the enthusiastic reports which came in from different states from time to time it might have been assumed that the million limit would not only be reached but passed. But when the petition was actually presented, it contained only 404,825 names. Of these, according to Mrs. Shaw's statement, 163,438 were of women, 122,382 of men and 119,005

were "not classified." Whether these last were children or adults and for what reason it was impossible to classify them must be left to conjecture. But, assuming that half of these unclassified signers were women, and that all the signatures were bona fide and capable of verification, the outcome of all this suffrage activity concentrated upon this single object for more than a year is to show that 222,940 American women want the ballot. In a total population of 100,000,000, more or less, that is not a very impressive proportion. Last year in England the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League, after only three or four months' canvass, presented to Parliament a petition against suffrage, signed by 254,620 women, and with all the signatures officially verified.

A PROTEST against the proposed suffrage amendment to the Constitution of the United States was sent last April to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and the Woman Suffrage Committee of the Senate, signed by the presidents of the New York, Massachusetts, Illinois, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island Associations Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women. The following paragraphs express clearly the fundamental principles upon which the protest rests:

"There are limitations and peculiarities belonging to women as a sex which demand at the hands of men corresponding immunities and more protections, and, as time has progressed, these have been more and more generally recognized and given. Special legislation, based upon the necessities of sex, has grown to command the support of our most eminent and intelligent statesmen.

"To grant the power to make laws to men and women equally, and thereby destroy man's sense of responsibility for woman's welfare, would leave the latter to enjoy only such special privileges as she could win by fighting for them, and even if woman had the unrestricted right to vote, any struggle between man and woman would be most unequal."

BY ITS FRUITS.

It is surely permissible to test woman suffrage, as other things are tested, by its fruits. Especially is this true in a state like Colorado, which has a larger population than any other suffrage state, and one in which the sexes are nearly equally divided. In another column, THE REMONSTRANCE reprints from Everybody's Magazine for May some passages from Judge Lindsey's article in which he describes his disappointing experience when he appealed to Denver women for help in his war upon the "Beast."

Now, there is further evidence as to Colorado, and this again from a Colorado source. At the election in Denver last May the "wets" carried the city by an overwhelming majority of about 15,000. Commenting upon this surprising result, the Fort Collins, Colorado, Express of May 17 makes the incident the occasion for a general summing up of the fruits of woman suffrage in Colorado, in these words:

The great surprise of the Denver election was the size of the wet majority. The wets polled two votes to one for the drys. Every ward but one voted wet. It had been expected that the woman's vote would be dry, but the result showed that their influence and vote did not tend to change the result from what it would have been had only the men voted. Over the whole Nation the equal suffrage movement has received a backset. The women voted in large numbers, but must have voted as wet as the men. While every one must concede that women have as much right to vote as do men, yet no one has ever pointed out where woman suffrage had any influence for good. Colorado has the poorest laws of the Nation when it comes to questions where women are affected. In Colorado the husband can sell or mortgage the home without the wife's consent. He may squander the money and she has no means of preventing it. On moral questions the laws of Colorado are famous for their weakness or absence. The liquor laws of Colorado are not up to the standard of other states. No search or seizure law is in effect in the state, and without such a law the illicit sale of liquor cannot be suppressed. The women of Colorado are on trial in regard to the suffrage movement. Their failure to benefit Colorado by their suffrage is doing more to retard woman suffrage in other states and nations than anything else. If Colorado as a result of woman suffrage had laws above the average, especially on moral questions and where the rights of women are affected, if it was a state that could be pointed to with pride in regard to its laws and their enforcement, if the City of Denver as a result of their ballot could be changed from the worst city, morally, in the land, to one of even average decency, then the suffragettes could give a reason for asking for the franchise in other states, aside from the bare statement that the right is theirs, and that no one denies.

SUFFRAGE AND THE FAMILY.

To vote intelligently is to think and act in the imperative mood; and to be qualified as voters, girls must be trained to think, feel, and act in the spirit of men. . . . Imbued with the governing spirit, woman will become as restive in her position as would man if similarly placed. This is avowed by many advocates of Woman Suffrage, and held up as a result to be desired. The more consistent go fearlessly to the end, and define marriage as a civil contract to be terminated at the will of either party, and society as a collection of independent units instead of an assemblage of families. That there are exceptions to the ideal family, here assumed as the nucleus of society, is true. Some women rule their husbands; a larger number through the misfortune, weakness, or wickedness of the husband are obliged to support the family, and there are many single women and widows. These exceptions to the general law often have much to bear; but not so much as to justify the overthrow of the whole structure with a view to rebuild upon exceptions. — *Dr. James M. Buckley.*